Iowa Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Request for Iowa Four-Year College/University Performance Assessment System Funds

College/University name: Faith Baptist Bible College
Contact Person:
     Name: Don Long
     Address: 1900 4th Street
            Ankeny, IA 50023
     Telephone: 515-964-0601   Fax: 515-964-1638
     E-Mail: longd@faith.edu

Business Office Contact Person:
     Name: Dr. John Hartog II
     Title: Director of Campus Operations
     Address: 1900 NW 4th Street
     Telephone: 515-964-0601   Fax: 515-964-1638
     E-mail: hartogj2@faith.edu

Statement of Assurances

Should a Performance Assessment System Award be made to the applicant in support of the activities proposed in this application, the authorized signature on the cover page of this application certifies to the Iowa Department of Education that the authorized official will:

1. Upon request, provide the Iowa Department of Education with access to records and other sources of information that may be necessary to determine compliance with appropriate federal and state laws and regulations;
2. Use grant funds to supplement and not supplant funds from nonfederal sources.

Certification by Authorized or Institutional Official:
The applicant certifies that to the best of his/her knowledge the information in this application is correct, that the filing of this application is duly authorized by the governing body of this organization, or institution, and that the applicant will comply with the attached statement of assurances.

Typed or Printed Name of Authorized Official	Title

Signature of Authorized Official	Date

Request for Performance Assessment System Funds

I. Context

Faith Baptist Bible College (FBBC) is a church-related institution of higher education for the purpose of preparing leaders and workers for Christian organizations and ministries. It has a unique niche in higher education by preparing pastors, missionaries, administrative assistants, youth pastors, ministers of music, and Christian school teachers for vocational ministry. However, many of its graduates enter businesses and organizations that are not ministry or church related and still they contribute to their communities as good, stable citizens by engaging in a variety of service capacities.

The Teacher Education Program (TEP) at FBBC is one of six vocational ministry preparation programs with the express purpose of preparing future teachers for Iowa's and the nation's schools, especially for its Christian schools. The TEP is the largest of the six programs with approximately 90 students involved at one phase/level or another in the program in the 2007-2008 school year. The tables below show the scope of degrees offered, enrollment figures of the college and the TEP, and faculty information both in the college and in the program.

Table 1.1 – Degrees and Endorsements offered by the Teacher Education Program

Programs	Elementary Education	Secondary Education	K-12 Education
Degrees Offered	• Bachelor of Science • Bachelor of Arts	• Bachelor of Science • Bachelor of Arts	• Bachelor of Science • Bachelor of Arts
Endorsements Offered	• K-6 Teacher (#102) • Music K-6 (#144)	• Eng./Lang. Arts (#120) • Music 7-12 (#145)	• Music (#144 & 145) • Middle Sch. (#182) • Coaching (#101)

Table 1.2 – Total College Enrollment Last Five Years (fall semester figures)
　　　　　Total Teacher Education Program Enrollment* Last Five Years

*All students who are identified with the program —freshman through senior years

School Year	# Full-Time Students	# Part-Time Students	Total # TEP Majors (%)		# Full-Time TEP Students	# Part-Time TEP Students	Elem Majors # (%)		Sec Majors # (%)		K-12 Music Majors # (%)	
2006	287	35	80	25%	75	5	55	17%	16	5%	9	3%
2005	311	19	91	28%	82	9	58	18%	23	7%	10*	3%
2004	338	20	103	29%	96	7	73	20%	17	5%	13*	4%
2003	377	15	116	30%	114	2	86	22%	17	4%	13*	3%
2002	388	15	105	26%	102	3	82	20%	15	4%	8	2%

* These figures include double majors (Music Ed. + other).

Table 1.3 – Total College Graduates Last Five Years; Total Program Graduates Last Five Years

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
College	80	107	88	72	44
Program	17	28	21	20	16
% of Program to College Graduates	21%	26%	24%	28%	41%

Table 1.4 – Total Number of Full Time and Part Time College Faculty
Total Number of Full Time and Part Time Program Faculty Last Five Years

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
College FT	16	14	14	13	21
College PT	16	14	14	13	11
Program FT	4	4	4	4	5
Program PT	2	2	3	3	2

Table 1.5 – Number of Individuals Completing Each Endorsement Area Last Five Years

Endorsements Offered	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
K-6 Teacher (#102)	13	18	16	17	12
7-12 Eng./Lang. Arts (#120)	3	6	1	2	3
K-6 Music (#144 only)			1		
7-12 Music (#145 only)					
Both K-6 and 7-12 Music	1	1	2	1	1
M.S. Teacher (#182)	1	3	3	3	1
Athletic Coach (#101)				1	1

Within the past four years, the TEP has instituted a portfolio system as the mechanism for candidates to demonstrate the meeting of program standards. The six TEP standards incorporate and address the ten INTASC standards and the Iowa Chapter 79 standards. Students in the lower levels (years 2 through fall of year 4) are required to create a "working" or "developmental" portfolio (Portfolio I) in either a paper or e-portfolio format. Seniors, as student teachers in the spring semester, create a portfolio based on their student teaching experience (Portfolio II). This, too, can be a paper or an electronic portfolio—the choice is theirs. Students choosing the electronic approach utilize an in-house program via PowerPoint. However, by going with *Chalk and Wire(CW)*, all portfolios will become e-portfolios, and it will allow for data analyses and management of portfolio results—both for candidate assessment and program assessment.

In this current school year, 2007-08, we implemented the first phase of the *CW* system. We started slowly—with the class of 20 sophomores, which was a scaled-down version of our original plan of starting with more students in more classes. We followed the advice of other *CW* users who had implemented it with larger numbers of students on their campuses. We are grateful for that advice; we have had a relatively smooth operation in our first year of using *CW*.

☐ June, 2007: Geoff Irvine, Creator and CEO of (*CW*), visited the FBBC campus for four days and held workshops for the TEP faculty and FBBC faculty of other programs. One administrator from another Iowa IHE also attended. The purpose of the workshops was to initiate and to instruct the TEP faculty into the workings of *CW*. The $4000 expense for the workshop was paid by the TQE grant.

☐ Summer, 2007: TEP faculty continued to work with the *CW* system in order to be "up and running" by the start of the new school year. Budgeted money from the grant paid for summer stipends for the TEP faculty.

☐ September, 2007: *CW* accounts were purchased through the grant for the sophomores in the TEP. The first training session was held. Dr. Mark Stupka is the trainer and "*CW* Guru" on the TEP faculty!

☐ Fall Semester, 2007: Several training sessions were held with the sophomores with TEP faculty attending sessions as needed. Students created their portfolio website and began to upload their first portfolio artifacts and reflective pieces. TEP faculty began to assess students' work online using the *CW* system.

☐ Spring Semester, 2008: Students continued to upload artifacts and coversheets for assessment. Only six artifacts per student this first year have been required—a nice, easy approach into learning the system! New hardware was purchased via the grant to better facilitate the creation and application of video clips and paper reproductions for uploading. We bought two state-of-the-art digital camcorders with tripods and a nice scanner. Both students and faculty have been using the new equipment.

We are very pleased with *CW* as this first year of implementation is coming to an end. It has been a relatively smooth transition. The only small glitch was the new features that *CW* installed that we did not fully grasp at first, but that has been worked through and we are back on track.

Accounting of Grant Funds for Year One

We have spent, or will be spending, the funds according to the Action Plan and Budget Requests as submitted for our first year of the grant, as follows:

Purpose	Budget	Spent (or to be Spent)
--Training with Geoff Irvine:	$3900	3900
--Summer Stipends for TEP faculty	6000	5080
--Student Trouble Shooter/Assistant	2800	--0--*
--Student *CW* Accounts:	2490	1715**
--Equipment:	1700	1800
--Additional *CW* Training/Support	3000	3000 (projected)
+ TEP faculty visit to Graceland Univ. for consultation and advice. May, 2008		
+ TEP faculty trip to users' group conference in Arkansas. June 2008		
Total:	$18980	$15495

*We did not hire a student since we scaled back from starting with juniors and sophomores to going only with sophomores thinking that we could handle the training and troubleshooting via the faculty. That has worked OK, but next year we plan to hire a student since we will be expanding the number of students using *CW*.

** We purchased accounts only for sophomores and not juniors as originally budgeted.

II. Project Narrative

Faith Baptist Bible College is attempting to construct a stronger candidate and unit assessment system based on a valid and reliable data collection process for tracking candidate performance and for program evaluation. We believe the *CW* system will prove to be very helpful in these efforts even though we are in the beginning phase of learning the system and only assessing students' portfolio artifacts online at this time (our first year).

Candidate Assessment. In addition to helping candidates create and mange their personal portfolios, it allows for an effective way for faculty to assess candidates' portfolios. Once we have developed and implemented the *CW* system throughout the entire TEP, we expect then to use the system to aggregate and disaggregate data derived from candidates portfolio assessments. Since the *CW* structure has been created around our program standards and rubrics have been designed to assess students' attainment of standards, it will be easy to see and understand the breakdown of students' level of attainment of program standards. Once we begin to see the patterns that develop through this process, the TEP faculty can effect curricular and/or instructional changes to address weaknesses that will appear.

Unit Assessment

We are eager to utilize the *CW* system for program assessment. In addition to gathering and analyzing data from portfolio assessments for program assessment, we will be creating mechanisms and tools through *CW* that should give us very helpful data for better understanding the strength and weaknesses of our TEP. We will be learning this summer how to create surveys using the *CW* system so that we can more effectively gather data from the following sources: 1) administrators of our graduates, 2) first-year (and possibly third-year) teaching graduates, 3) the final evaluation of student teachers completed by cooperating teachers, and 4) surveys of program completers following student teaching. We want to make our program assessment simple yet effective. By using the four above stated assessments which are in addition to the data we will find from portfolio assessment data, we are confident we can have very helpful assessment data for program evaluation.

Use of Requested Money

We plan to use the grant money, if awarded, to continue with and to enhance the broad purposes as originally requested, namely, to have an effective candidate and program assessment in place and which can be sustained once the grant money is done. For the 2008-09 school year, we will use the money to effect the following. (Amounts will be reflected in the "Action Plan" and "Budget Requests.")

- To purchase extended (multiple years) *CW* student accounts.
- To purchase additional hardware.
- To hire a student assistant trainer/trouble-shooter.
- To allow the TEP faculty to attend user-group conferences to improve their CW understandings and skill of use.
- To provide summer stipends for TEP faculty.

III. Action Plan –

Goal	Objectives	Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Budget Request
1. Refine, improve, and expand the implementation and effectiveness of the *CW* system through Dec. 2009 with the goal of having sustainability beyond that time.	1a. Expand the number of candidates using *CW*.	1a. Purchase new accounts for entering sophomores and one additional yeare for juniors. We will then be working with sophomores and juniors in the TEP for portfolio assessment	1a. Mark Stupka and/or Don Long	1a. August, 2008	1a. Fall 2008: 22 Sophomores @ $90/account : $1980 20 Juniors @ $53/account: $1040 Fall 2009: 25 sophomores@ $90/account $2250 Total: $5270
	1b. 1d. Begin to utilize the capabilities of the *CW* system for program assessment based on sophomores' portfolio assessments.	1b. TEP faculty to analyze results of sophomores' portfolio assessments. Use this info as formative assessment for making adjustments in our assessment system.	1b. TEP faculty	1b. Summer, 2008	
	1c. Improve the TEP faculty's knowledge and skill in using the *CW* system. 1d. Take advantage of training and user-group opportunities to position ourselves for the time when grant funds are ended.	1c and d. TEP faculty to attend *CW* user-groups and/or training workshops sponsored by *CW*	1c-d. Don Long	1c-d. As needed and available during the 2008-09 school year and especially in the summer of 2009.	1b. Faculty summer stipend $5000 1c-d. Further training-for use through summer 2009 $2700
2. Provide the human and material resources necessary to provide candidates the support and assistance needed for the next phases of the *CW* implementation	2a. Hire and train a student "consultant/trouble-shooter" to assist Dr. Stupka and new candidates to the system with the technical aspects and use of the *CW* system.	2a. Interview, hire, and train a student by the end of August, 2008	Mark Stupka with TEP faculty involved	Begin duties by mid-September, 2008	$2800
	2b. Purchase additional hardware to facilitate TEP faculty-to-candidate communication and timely assessment of portfolio artifacts.	2b. Purchase 3 laptops for TEP faculty to share amongst them for *CW* portfolio assessment while off-campus.	Don Long	Purchase by Sept. 30, 2008	$2700
3. Collaborate with other Iowa TEPs using *CW* (Grand View, Graceland, Emmaus, etc.) to share information on the use and effectiveness of the *CW* system.	3. Continue dialogue and interactions with other *CW* users in Iowa TEPs in order to leverage the growing expertise being gained through use over time with *CW*.	3. Arrange to visit other Iowa TEPs using *CW* for candidate and program assessment.	Don Long with TEP faculty attending	As needed and available during the 2008-09 school year and especially in the summer of 2009.	$ 500

IV. Sustainability Plan

In order to provide sustainability beyond the grant, we are wanting to capitalize on the grant money through December of 2009 to do our utmost in training and skill development for the TEP faculty in using the *Chalk and Wire* system for effective candidate and program assessment in order to facilitate program improvement. Also, the grant money will be used to purchase the *CW* accounts of current students as they progress through the program and new students as they enter through the fall of 2009. We are giving ourselves this two-plus grant years we have available for us as a "pilot" or "trial run" to learn the system and to skillfully use the *CW* capabilities. For example, we purchased a three-year account for sophomores this year. For the 2008-09 school year, we want to purchase a four-year account for each sophomore plus another year for next year's juniors. In the fall of 2009, we want to purchase for those sophomores a four-year account to take them through their college years and into their first year of teaching. Here's the point: by doing it this way, we will not be charging students for their *CW* accounts while we TEP faculty are learning the system. Once we are fully skillful at using the *CW* system, we have no qualms about charging TEP students when they enter the program as sophomores. By then (fall 2010), our *CW* system will be a "smooth running machine" and students will appreciate the value of *CW* and will have a sense that their money is being well spent as they use *CW*.

The equipment we will have purchased via the grant will sustain us for many years. If approved, we will be using the three laptops. Combining that with the two camcorders and scanner already purchased, we will be in good shape for helping both candidates and faculty with creating portfolios and assessing candidates' work

The student "trouble-shooter" hired with grant money can be sustained in the future. We believe we can absorb the $2800/year costs into our program's operating budget.

If money is needed to help TEP faculty with periodic training on *CW*, the college's faculty development program can "kick in" to support such activities. It is a very liberal and generous program and we have no doubt that attending a summer user-group for one or two faculty on a rotating basis over the years will be accomplished.

In summary, we believe the entire electronic assessment system via *Chalk and Wire* is very sustainable beyond the final grant year. We are pleased with *CW* this first year of using it, and we are excited about extending it and growing it in the years ahead as we learn how to take full advantage of its capabilities. In addition, its use in the TEP has good support from the administration, and we know it will be supported financially as needed in the future.

We are very appreciative and grateful for the grant and for the wisdom of those responsible for encouraging TEPs to go with an electronic assessment system, something we probably would not have done due to the start-up expense of such systems. A fear of ours when considering using the grant for an electronic system was its sustainability. One of the advantages with going with *CW* is that the institutional costs—and even the costs for candidates—is very little beyond the initial training requirements. We see no problem whatsoever of sustaining the *CW* system beyond the grant.

V. Budget Requests

Personnel		Budget
• Wages: Student Consultant/Trouble-shooter @ $10.00/hr. x 28 wks/yr. • Summer TEP faculty work (equivalent of 2 cr. hr. of work @ $500/hr. for 5 TEP faculty		$2800 $5000
Expenses (Travel, Meals, Lodging) • Visits to other Iowa *CW* users		$ 500
Professional Services/Professional Development		
Fees: Registration for one *CW* training or user-group conference for TEP faculty		$1200
Expenses (Mileage, Meals, Lodging, Room Rental) to one training session for TEP faculty		$1500
Software: Subscriptions to CW for candidates: • Fall 2008: 22 sophomores@$90/account + 20 juniors @$53/account • Fall 2009: 25 sophomores @ $90/account		$1980 $1040 $2250 Total: $5270
Hardware: 3 laptops @ $900 ea.		$2700
Supplies and Materials		---0---
Phone/Mail		---0---
Other – specify:		---0---
Other – specify:		---0---
Total		$18,970

VI. Budget Narrative

The following is an explanation of how the money will be used if granted.

☐ <u>To purchase *CW* student accounts</u>. We will be expanding the use of *CW* through the junior year while bringing in the new sophomore class. We want to purchase a one-year account for the juniors in order to carry them through their first year of teaching. We want to purchase a four-year account for the sophomores which will carry them through their three remaining years of college plus the year following graduation. Also, since this grant year will go through December of 2009, we will be purchasing in August of 2009 the four-year accounts for that year's sophomore class (2009-2010). Once the grant money is done, students will purchase their accounts on a yearly basis or for two, three, or four years. This process will begin for the sophomores in the fall of 2010 and the fee to purchase accounts will be reflected in admission literature and the current/updated college catalog.

☐ <u>To purchase additional hardware</u>. We TEP faculty are finding it helpful to have access to students' portfolio work at times other than when we are on campus and in our offices. All four TEP program faculty are on the road to visit student teachers—sometimes for days at a times. Often three of us are gone at the same time. We are requesting three laptops for the TEP for use on the road.

☐ <u>To hire a student assistant</u>. We are predicting the difficulty, with the number of students using *CW* doubling next school year, for faculty alone to adequately train students and to be available to answer their questions or to trouble shoot using the system. We would like to hire one student (we assume he/she would be a junior who has used *CW* for a year) to assist Dr. Stupka in his training sessions. This same (or another) student assistant would be available in the evenings to help students on campus with questions.

☐ <u>To allow the TEP faculty to attend user-group conferences</u>. We have heard from experienced *CW* users that attending the user-group conferences conducted by *CW* is extremely helpful. We are looking forward to our first such conference in June when five TEP faculty will be attending a three-day conference in Little Rock, Arkansas. We would like to attend another such conference in the summer of 2009. We are including a "conference" amount during the 2008-09 school year as well as for one in the fall of 2009 if available and needed. We foresee the need to visit other campuses who are using *CW* so that we can make sure our *CW* system is being utilized to its fullest extent; we want to take advantage of the grant money to prepare ourselves as faculty and our TEP as much as possible while we can.

☐ <u>To provide summer stipends for TEP faculty</u>. The five TEP program faculty, plus the music education faculty person, will be using some of their summer break to review the results of the aggregate data from sophomores' portfolio assessments. We will also create rubrics and to otherwise prepare for the expansion of the *CW* system over the next two summers. Over the next two summers the amount of time faculty will need to spend on *CW* probably will decrease as we become more knowledgeable and skillful with using *CW* to assess candidate learning. However, it will still require of us time alone, and together, making sure we are prepared for using the system as it expands to accommodate the growing number of student users.